





## INTIMATIONS

BROWN, JONES &amp; CO.

DEALERS IN  
AMERICAN AND ITALIAN MARBLE  
AND HONGKONG GRANITE.

## CEMETERY MEMORIALS.

Designs and Prices on application.  
Office, 47, QUEEN'S ROAD CENTRAL. [2087]

## EYE-SIGHT.

## NOTICE.

MR. N. LAZARUS, Oculist-Optician, of  
London and Gibraltar, may be con-  
sulted for SPECTACLES at the HONG-  
KONG HOTEL (Room No. 139)  
FOR A FEW DAYS ONLY.

A great proportion of ophthalmic diseases  
affecting those advancing in life occur to those  
having some degree of the construction of  
the eye of the young years of "Eyes Strain"  
ending in serious forms of disease. Glasses  
specially adapted in youth to those requiring  
them save and preserve the sight.  
Constantly wearing, however, of glasses  
diminishes vision; weak eyes, the letters  
running together; any of those symptoms indi-  
cate a deficiency in the form of the eye require  
Glasses only to correct and cure.  
MR. LAZARUS supplies his SPECTA-  
CLES only after testing the sight.

## ADVICE FREE.

HONGKONG HOTEL,  
(Room No. 139).

THE TIMES states that the Russian Mission  
to Abyssinia has secured great influence with  
the Negus and that it will remain in the country  
as long as the British remain in Egypt.

A. S. WATSON &amp; CO., LIMITED.

ESTABLISHED A.D. 1841.

THE VERY LATEST NOVELTIES

## IN

CHRISTMAS CARDS

## AND

NEW YEAR CARDS,

## AND

HAND PAINTED, ARTISTIC,

## AND

ATTRACTIVE.

## WHOLESALE

CONFECTIONERY

## AND

DELICIOUS SWEETS

## IN

LARGE ASSORTMENT.

## FRENCH CONFECTIONERY AND

CONSERVES FROM THE BEST PARISIAN

## HOUSES.

## CRYSTALLIZED FRUITS.

SPECIAL CONSIGNMENTS

## OR

CHOICEST CHOCOLATES.

\*FANCY BOXES OF RARE DESIGNS  
FOR PRESENTS.

A. S. WATSON &amp; CO., LIMITED.

THE HONGKONG DISPENSARY.

Hongkong, 12th November, 1896. [22]

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS

Only communications relating to the news columns  
should be addressed to the Editor.  
Correspondents must forward their names and address  
with communications addressed to the Editor, not  
to the publisher, but to the Editor of the paper.  
All letters for publication should be written on one  
side of the paper only.  
Orders for extra copies of DAILY PRESS should be  
sent before 11 a.m. on day of publication. After that  
hour the price is 10 cents. Only Cash.  
Telephone, 222. Telegrams, C.O. Code.  
P.O. Box 20. Only Cash.

## The Daily Press

HONGKONG, DECEMBER 4th, 1896.

The Hongkong Philharmonic Society will  
give a concert on Thursday, 17th December.The T. & O. steamer *Sunda*, which arrived  
yesterday, brought out about 180 military  
decks for the Hongkong garrison.Owing to the bad state of the weather Mrs.  
Black's at Home, which was to have been  
held yesterday, has been postponed until Tues-  
day next, 8th instant.The *Peking* and *Tientsin* Steamer of the 21st  
November says—The steamer *Glanville*, with  
the bridge-work for the Peking and Tientsin  
railway, arrived during the week, and is busy  
lightening at the Bar. The arrival of this  
steamer, in time to admit of discharging her  
cargo, improves the chance of unloading being  
run through to Peking in the early spring.A Spanish gentleman recently came to Hong-  
kong from Manila because he thought he would  
be safer in this colony than in his own disturbed  
country. He stayed at a friend's house in Mosquito  
Street and one day came to the police station  
and told him that he had been robbed of two  
gold rings, set with diamonds and rubies and  
valued at \$150. The thief turned out to be  
the houseboy, and yesterday he was  
chained at the Police Court and sent to goal  
for three months.Yesterday morning H.E. the Governor met  
the newly elected directors of the Tung Wah  
Hospital at the Council Chamber and addressed  
them regarding the proposed changes in that  
institution. His Excellency intimated that a  
steward was to be appointed to look after the  
cleanliness of the institution, and that while  
patients were to be desired to be treated  
by Chinese doctors were to be at liberty to be  
so treated it was also right that they should  
have the opportunity of being treated according  
to Western medicine if they so desired, and it was  
therefore proposed to appoint a Chinese trained  
in Western medicine to reside at the  
hospital; also His Excellency hoped to be able  
to appoint an officer whose sole duty it would be  
to visit the Tung Wah (the Colonial Surgeon  
not having the necessary time) and who would  
be at all times ready to give the committee the  
benefit of his advice and assistance. Lastly,  
His Excellency intimated that if he found any  
one trying to stir up trouble and create bad  
feeling in connection with the new appoint-  
ments he would take prompt steps to deal  
with him. Owing to the late hour the com-  
mittee were compelled to hold over the full report of His  
Excellency's speech.

The football match which was to have been  
played yesterday afternoon between the Hong-  
kong Football Club and the 35th Co. R.A.,  
did not take place, owing to the late weather.

Mr. Maurice William Ernest de Bunsen,  
H.M. Chargé d'Affaires in Siam, has been  
promoted to the post of Chief Secretary to the  
British Embassy at Washington.

At the meeting of the Sanitary Board yester-  
day before the regulation of households  
for providing for the sanitary maintenance of  
the colony, the members of the Board, both  
of Ordinance 15 of 1884 (Closed Houses and In-  
sanitary Dwellings Ordinance) were considered  
and passed.

We are requested by the committee of the A1  
Prose Fête of the Society of St. Vincent, to  
attend to the notice of the Fête held on the  
17th November last amount to about  
\$2,000. The committee desire to publicly acknow-  
ledge their appreciation of the generous support  
accorded to the Society by the community, both  
Chinese and European. The treasurer requests  
that those gentlemen who have not yet paid for  
the tickets sent to them will kindly do so as  
soon as possible.

The *China Gazette* of the 24th November  
says—There is apparently some great upset in  
the railway station in the north, owing to  
active appearance of the Belgians and the  
Bulgarians are reported to be supported by  
both France and Russia in order to freeze the  
Americans and British out. Several  
thousands of troops for this purpose are sent off  
the last boat of the season. It is reported that  
the head office of the Peking-Hankow Railway  
will be at Shanghai.

## REUTERS' TELEGRAMS.

(SUPPLIED TO THE "DAILY PRESS")

LONDON, 1st December.

## RUSSIA AND ABYSSINIA.

The Times states that the Russian Mission  
to Abyssinia has secured great influence with  
the Negus and that it will remain in the country  
as long as the British remain in Egypt.

THE RUSSIAN PRESS AND THE  
SCARCITY OF INDIA.

The Moscow *Pravda* strongly protests  
against the Russian Government organizing  
relief for the Indian famine.

## SUPREME COURT.

3rd December.

## IN SUMMARY JURISDICTION.

BEFORE MR. T. SCORRER SMITH (ACTING  
PUNISH JUDGE).

CHIV CHIT SHI v. CHEUNG KAM TIN.

Plaintiff claimed \$500, money lent by him  
to the wife of the defendant, who is com-  
pound to Messrs. Meyer and Co. Mr. W. W. Money,  
appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr. J. Hastings  
defended.The action was tried on the 29th November.  
The learned Judge, in his judgment, said—Owing to the importance and novelty  
of the point raised by Mr. Hastings for the  
defence I have considered it neces-  
sary to write my judgment in this form, so  
that it may be read by the jury.A widow Chiu Chiu having lent \$550 to  
Cheung Kam Tin, wife of Cheung Kam Tin, now  
sues to recover this sum from Kam Tin, her  
husband. Assuming to be proved that the  
money was lent as alleged, that Cheung Kam  
Tin was at the date of the loan living apart  
from Cheung Kam Tin by reason of the latter's mis-  
conduct, and that Cheung Kam Tin, by reason of  
separation made his wife a monthly allowance  
of \$10; that this allowance is adequate; and  
that Cheung Kam Tin has spent the \$550 which  
she borrowed upon her own private expenses,  
Cheung Kam Tin contends that at law his wife,  
under the circumstances, was liable to her  
husband with absolute authority to pledge her  
husband's credit for necessities and that he  
only, and not she, was liable to her husband's  
agent to make him liable for money advanced to  
her for the purpose of procuring necessities and  
actually applied to such purpose; that only in  
cases where the money was not so applied, but  
was lent to her for her own private use, was  
she liable to her husband for money lent to her  
and expended on necessities; that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to his wife's creditor for money supplied to her  
and expended on necessities, and that the summary  
jurisdiction in equity of the Supreme Court of  
this Colony is not confined to cases where the  
money was lent to her for her own private use,  
but extends to cases where the money was lent  
to her for her husband's use, and that in such  
cases the alleged equitable liability of a husband  
to



\_\_\_\_\_



